



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,621	03/08/2001	Jan Gerben Wijnstra	NL000122	8300
24737	7590	09/02/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	
DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/801,621	Applicant(s) WIJNSTRA, JAN GERBEN	
	Examiner Haresh Patel	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are presented for examination.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment to the specification, filed on 7/9/2004, is acknowledged.

Drawings

3. Drawings submitted on 7/9/2004 are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McDevitt et al. "Portable sensor array system", US Publication, 2003/0186228 A1 Oct., 2, 2003 (Hereinafter McDevitt).
6. As per claim 1, McDevitt teaches a computer readable medium containing a computer program for managing a family of systems having a shared family architecture (e.g., component-

Art Unit: 2154

based techniques, and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 425) based upon commonly used generic blocks of software (e.g., use of ActiveX controls, JavaBeans, Microsoft foundation classes, col., 43, paragraph 425) and wherein

a component framework that comprises a skeleton of software architecture (e.g., component-based techniques and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 425) and supports participating software plug-in components (e.g., use of ActiveX controls, JavaBeans, Microsoft foundation classes, col., 43, paragraph 425);

individual software plug-in components provides one or more services/functions (e.g., inherent functionality of Javabeans, paragraph 425); and

the component framework defines roles/actions (e.g., configuration of analysis software by the component-based techniques and/or object oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph, 423) providing one or more common interfaces for communication of series of several plug-in components (e.g., use of component-based and/or object-oriented interfaces, col., 43, paragraph 419 and 420) that manipulate hardware associated with the component framework (e.g., parts the system to serve patient, i.e., x-ray detector/sensor/bed, utilizing component-based techniques and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 419 and 420, col., 16, paragraphs 187-194).

7. As per claim2, McDevitt teaches the following

the component framework includes an inventory function for assessing available services in the participating plug-in components (e.g., central data service performing a test to check the available supporting services supported by the software modules, paragraph 460, col., 47).

8. As per claim 6, McDevitt teaches the following

the family members are medical diagnostic systems comprising an x-ray examination apparatus (e.g., parts the system to serve patient, i.e., x-ray detector/sensor/bed, utilizing component-based techniques and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 419 and 420, col., 16, paragraphs 187-194).

9. As per claim 7, McDevitt teaches a complex system (e.g., portable sensor array system, title), comprising an x-ray examination apparatus having a computer readable-medium comprising software architecture (e.g., x-ray detector/sensor of the system utilizing component-based techniques and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 419 and 420, col., 16, paragraphs 187-194) and wherein

a component framework that comprises a skeleton of software architecture (e.g., component-based techniques, and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 425) and supports participating software plug-in components (e.g., use of ActiveX controls, JavaBeans, Microsoft foundation classes, col., 43, paragraph 425);

individual software plug-in components (e.g., use of ActiveX controls, JavaBeans, Microsoft foundation classes, col., 43, paragraph 425) providing one or more services (e.g., inherent functionality of Javabeans, paragraph 425) including rotation displacements of components of an X-ray apparatus including X-ray source and X-ray detector, and a patient table (e.g., parts the system to serve patient, i.e., x-ray detector/sensor/bed, utilizing component-based

Art Unit: 2154

techniques and/or object-oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph 419 and 420, col., 16, paragraphs 187-194), and

the component framework defines roles/actions (e.g., configuration of analysis software by the component-based techniques and/or object oriented techniques, col., 43, paragraph, 423) that provide one or more common interfaces for communication of services of several participating software plug-in components (e.g., use of component-based and/or object-oriented interfaces, col., 43, paragraph 419 and 420).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDevitt in view of Java 2 Platform, Enterprise edition, J2EE, Sun Microsystems, 12/17/1999. (Hereinafter Sun).

12. As per claims 3-5, McDevitt teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claim 2. McDevitt does not specifically mention about the claimed limitations of claims 3-5. It is well known in the art, to implement an inventory function utilizing APIs that can implement the claimed limitations of claims 3-5, for example, Sun, teaches the following:

the inventory function, includes initializing the services (e.g., use of interfaces and classes to initialize services, section 2.1, chapter 2), assesses available services at initialization of

Art Unit: 2154

the system or during run-time of the system (e.g., use of interfaces and classes to evaluate present services, section 2.1, chapter 2) , and maintains a list of available services (e.g., use of interfaces and classes to monitor the present number of services in the system, section 2.1, chapter 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McDevitt and Sun in order to facilitate a function to initializing the services, assesses available services, and maintains a list of available services. McDevitt clearly mention that his system uses software modules to maintain the system, which are based on component-based techniques, and/or object-oriented techniques. Sun discloses the interfaces and classes that can help initializing the services, assesses available services, and maintains a list of available services. The motivation would be obvious, because the system of McDevitt is implemented using the concept of component-based techniques, and/or object-oriented techniques, and with the well-known available interfaces and classes would help develop a system to handle the services for the system.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2154

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Haresh Patel

August 28, 2004

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100